

REMARKS

Claims 1-23 are pending. Claims 1, 11-12, 17-18, 21 and 23 are amended herein. No new matter is added as a result of the claim amendments.

103 Rejections

Claims 1-5, 9-10 and 12-23

The instant Office Actions states that Claims 1-5, 9-10 and 12-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Geiger (U.S. Patent No. 5,420,828) in view of Cannon et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,028,625). The Applicants have reviewed the cited references and respectfully submit that the present invention as recited in Claims 1-5, 9-10 and 12-23 is not anticipated nor rendered obvious by Geiger and Cannon, alone or in combination.

Applicants respectfully agree with the statement in the instant Office Action that “Geiger ... fails to disclose an image storage system positioned outside said mask capable of storing said images, said image storage system being in close proximity to said user and operatively connected to said imaging subsystem by wireless communication.”

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Geiger does not show or suggest “an image storage system positioned outside said mask and capable of storing said images, said image storage system carried on a body part of said user and operatively connected to said imaging subsystem by wireless communication” as recited in independent Claim 1; “an image storage system positioned outside said diving mask capable of storing said images, said image storage system being carried by said user and operatively connected to said imaging subsystem by wireless

communication” as recited in independent Claim 17; “transmitting by wireless communication said images to an image storage system capable of storing said images, said image storage system being positioned outside said mask and carried on a body part of said user” as recited in independent Claim 18; nor “transmitting said images to an image storage system positioned outside said mask and in proximity to said user by wireless communication using a wireless transmitter and a wireless receiver, said wireless receiver capable of receiving said images from said imaging subsystem, said image storage system carried by said user and including an image storage subsystem operatively connected to said wireless receiver” as recited in independent Claim 23.

Applicants respectfully submit that Cannon does not overcome the shortcomings of Geiger and respectfully disagree with the statements in the instant Office Action to the contrary. The instant Office Action states “Cannon shows that it’s well known and used to have image storage in a helmet.” However, Cannon (alone or in combination with Geiger) does not show or suggest image storage in a helmet. The instant Office Action also states “The system of Geiger in view of Cannon is capable of mounting an image storage system on a body part of a diver.” However, as already noted in the instant Office Action, Geiger does not show or suggest an image storage system carried by the user, and Cannon requires that the image storage system be transported using a truck (recording vehicle 52, Figure 1 of Cannon). Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Geiger and Cannon, alone or in combination, do not show or suggest an image storage system capable of being mounted on a body part of a diver. More specifically, Applicants respectfully submit that Geiger and Cannon, alone or in combination, do not show or suggest the limitations of Claims 1, 17, 18 and 23 cited above.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Geiger and Cannon, alone or in combination, do not show or suggest the embodiments of the present claimed invention recited in independent Claims 1, 17, 18 and 23, and that these claims are considered patentable over Geiger and Cannon (alone or in combination). Because Claims 2-5, 9-10, 12-16 and 19-22 depend from either Claim 1, 17, 18 or 23 and contain additional limitations, these claims are also considered patentable over Geiger and Cannon (alone or in combination). Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the basis for rejecting Claims 1-5, 9-10 and 12-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is traversed.

Claims 6-8 and 11

The instant Office Actions states that Claims 6-8 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Geiger in view of Cannon, and further in view of Jones (U.S. Patent No. 3,892,234) and Cochran (U.S. Patent No. 5,899,204). The Applicants have reviewed the cited references and respectfully submit that the present invention as recited in Claims 6-8 and 11 is not anticipated nor rendered obvious by Geiger, Cannon, Jones and Cochran, alone or in combination.

Claims 6-8 and 11 are dependent on Claim 1 and recite additional limitations. Hence, by demonstrating that Geiger, Cannon, Jones and Cochran, alone or in combination, do not show or suggest the present invention as recited in Claim 1, it is also demonstrated that Geiger, Cannon, Jones and Cochran, alone or in combination, do not show or suggest the present invention as recited in Claims 6-8 and 11.

As presented above, Applicants respectfully submit that Geiger and Cannon (alone or in combination) do not show or suggest “an image storage system positioned outside said mask and capable of storing said images, said image storage system carried on a body part of said user and operatively connected to said imaging subsystem by wireless communication” as recited in independent Claim 1. Applicants further submit that Jones and Cochran do not overcome the shortcomings of Geiger and Cannon.

Specifically, Applicants respectfully submit that neither Jones nor Cochran nor the combination thereof, alone or in combination with Geiger and Cannon, show or suggest show or suggest the limitations of Claim 1 cited above.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Geiger, Cannon, Jones and Cochran, alone or in combination, do not show or suggest the embodiment of the present claimed invention recited in independent Claim 1, and that Claim 1 is considered patentable over Geiger, Cannon, Jones and Cochran (alone or in combination). Because Claims 6-8 and 11 depend from Claim 1 and contain additional limitations, these claims are also considered patentable over Geiger, Cannon, Jones and Cochran (alone or in combination). Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the basis for rejecting Claims 6-8 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is traversed.

Conclusions

In light of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejected claims.

Based on the arguments presented above, Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 1-23 overcome the rejections of record and, therefore, Applicants respectfully solicit allowance of these claims.


Applicants have reviewed the references cited but not relied upon. Applicants did not find these references to show or suggest the present claimed invention: U.S. Patent Nos. 6,008,780; 6,039,446 and 6,525,762.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP

Date: 2/3/05



John P. Wagner, Jr.
Reg. No. 35,398

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, California 95113
(408) 938-9060